


**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

-----X
CHRISTINE M. ARAMAN,

Plaintiff,

-against-



21 **CIVIL** 8397 (RA)

JUDGMENT

REAL ESTATE BOARD OF NEW YORK; 237
105TH STREET LLC; REAL BROKER LLC;
ALEX ARAMAN; BEVERLY ARAMAN; PAUL
ARAMAN; SHIRLEY CABRERA; DR. SERGEI
KALSOW MD PC; CHARLIE SAHADI;
JONAHTAN GARDNER; FEDERAL BUREAU
OF INVESTIGATION; NINA CARLOW ESQ.;
AARON LEVY; MATHEW LEVY; ANNA
ARAMAN; ANNA ARAMAN C/O OCTOLY;
BARRY JANAY C/O RICK STEINER FELL &
BENOWITZ LLP; BARRY JANAY C/O THE
LAW OFFICE OF BARRY E. JANAY P.C.,

Defendants.
-----X

It is hereby **ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED:** That for the reasons stated in the Court's Order dated May 6, 2022, Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration is denied. The Court's November 9, 2021 order denied Plaintiff all relief and closed the case. Judgment is entered dismissing the action for lack of subject matter jurisdiction and as frivolous. In her April 26 submission, Plaintiff indicated for the first time that she intended her November 19 submission to act not only as a reconsideration motion, but also as a notice of appeal. "A notice of appeal filed after the court announces a decision or order but before the entry of the judgment or order-is treated as filed on the date of and after the entry." Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(2). Keeping in mind Plaintiff's pro se status, the Court construes Plaintiff's November 19 submission as a notice

of appeal and treats it as filed on the date that the Clerk of Court entered judgment in this case. Plaintiff may appeal that judgment consistent with the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. She is reminded, however, of the Court's prior certification under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that any appeal would not be taken in good faith, such that in forma pauperis status is denied for the purpose of an appeal. Plaintiff has consented to electronic service of court documents.

Dated: New York, New York
May 9, 2022

RUBY J. KRAJICK

Clerk of Court

BY:


Deputy Clerk
